11/1/72

Air Carrier On-Time Reporting Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary
October 26, 2000

Committee Members:	Affiliation
Stephen VanBeek	Associate Deputy Secretary, U.S. DOT
Russ Chew	American Airlines
Pete McDonald	United Airlines
Robert Kneisely	Southwest Airlines
Jim Coon	Air Transport Association
Ed Faberman	Air Carrier Association of America
Faye Malarkey	Regional Airline Association
Jay Wells	Air Line Pilots Association
Linda Moore	Airports Minority Advisory Council
David Stempler	Air Travelers Association
Ivan Bekkers	Official Airline Guide Worldwide
Paul Ruden	American Society of Travel Agents
Steve Kolski	Air Tran Airways
Lisa Piccione	Delta Air Lines, Alternate
Eugene Laney	National Business Travel Association, Alternate

Others:	
Sarah Siwek	Sarah Siwek & Associates, Facilitator
Don Camph	Sarah Siwek & Associates
Judy Kaleta	U.S. DOT/OGC
Dayton Lehman	U.S. DOT/OGC
Norman Strickman	U.S. DOT/OGC
Regis P. Milan	U.S. DOT/Office of Aviation & International Affairs
Carlton Wine	U.S. DOT/FAA
Shirley Miller	U.S. DOT/FAA
Carla Lounsbury	U.S. DOT/FAA
Walter Finch	U.S. DOT/Office of Associate Deputy Secretary
John S. White	U.S. DOT/FAA
Jack Ryan	Air Transport Association
David Mednick	U.S. DOT/BTS
Chris Soares	U.S. Treasury
Jeff Buffer	U.S.DOT/BTS

1) Review of October 25 Meeting Summary:

A number of revisions that were requested on the draft meeting summary will be incorporated into the final meeting summary to be transmitted to all members.

2) Presentation by FAA on Aviation System Performance Metric (ASPM):

Carlton Wine of the FAA made a presentation on the ASPM system. The ASPM system is under development (and has not been fully validated) pursuant to an agreement between the FAA, the Air Transport Association and participating carriers. The purpose of the system is for the industry and the FAA to better understand system performance through more accurate and timely data. The ASPM system is different from the OPSNET system that the Committee was briefed on at its October 25 meeting.

Ten participating carriers provide Out, Off, On, and In (OOOI) data to FAA. FAA provides arrival and departure rates by quarter hour and runway configuration at 21 airports. The FAA and participating carriers have agreed to definitions, methodology, and data sources to compute system performance metrics and to have data available on a next day basis.

Metrics- It was noted that the metrics are developed without any attribution to causes. Currently data is available from January 1, 2000 to present. The metrics that are computed are as follows:

Gate:	Actual gate departure time minus scheduled gate departure time
Taxi Out:	Actual taxi-out minus unimpeded taxi-out. This is developed for each airport on a seasonal basis and updated once a year based on prior year information.
Airport Departure:	Actual off time minus (scheduled gate departure time plus unimpeded taxi out time)
Airborne:	Actual airborne time minus carrier submitted time en route
Taxi-In:	Actual taxi-in time minus unimpeded taxi-in
Block:	Actual gate to gate time minus scheduled gate to gate time
Arrival:	Actual gate arrival time minus scheduled gate arrival time

Data is stored by (1) individual flights; (2) by airport, by carrier, by day, by hour, and by quarter hour; and (3) by city pair, by carrier, by day, by hour.

Airport Utilization- Airport utilization is also calculated using a departure score, an arrival score, and an airport score. These are computed as follows:

Departure Score- Percent of departure demand serviced given the departure rate which is based on runway configuration and weather conditions

Arrival Score- Percent of arrival demand serviced given the arrival rate which is based on runway configuration and weather conditions.

Airport Score- Weighted departure and arrival score

Scope of Coverage- The ASPM system includes information on 49 airports, however arrival and departure time information is only available at 21 of these airports.

Data Collection- Data is collected in an automated fashion (by the ACARS system) for 7 of the 10 participating carriers and 3 of the carriers report information manually (are non-ACARS equipped). It was also noted that some of the "ACARS" carriers have some non-ACARS equipped planes, and in those cases data are reported manually. FAA emphasized that the more carriers that participate in the ASPM system the better the information will be for measuring aviation system performance. FAA currently has to estimate about 40% of the information on a daily basis and then make revisions when monthly reports are filed.

3) Review of Draft Issues to be Addressed by the Advisory Committee:

The Chair opened this discussion by acknowledging the interconnected "system of systems" that comprise the national aviation system. He noted that sources of data on conditions within the overall system include airline provided information, airport information, FAA information, and weather data–which could be obtained from the National Weather Service or NOAA. These sources of data when analyzed as a whole would provide a better source of information about the causes of delays in this "system of systems". The Chair noted that information which could be generated from such analysis would be helpful to inform decision makers in both the public and private sectors on investments that would yield the highest dividends in terms of system performance. The Chair indicated that he would get back to the Committee at a future meeting with illustrative information on how such analysis might be conducted. While there was agreement about the complexity of the aviation system and the benefits of more robust analysis that takes into account the full range of relationships between individual systems and subsystems, the Committee requested a collaborative approach to developing such analysis techniques.

The facilitator distributed a draft list of issues the Committee might consider addressing and noted that this information was taken directly from the Part 234 requirements for data reporting by air carriers.

4) Continuation of Discussion on Potential Categories of Delay and Cancellations:

It was noted that consistency with FAA definitions is needed in deciding upon reporting categories under Part 234. The Chair noted that the U.S. DOT recognizes this and that FAA and BTS representatives were at the meeting and will be participating throughout the deliberations of the Advisory Committee.

Categories of Cancellations:

Three categories of cancellations were agreed to as follows:

Principal categories of cancellations (primary reason for cancellation):

- Cancellations within airline control (e.g., crew, maintenance, other)
- Cancellations due to the air traffic system (e.g., ATC, capacity, airports)
- Cancellations due to weather (e.g., extreme weather, below minimums)

The Chair noted that when the U.S. DOT decides to analyze this information along with other data including capacity benchmarks under development at FAA and ATC reliability information, he would present information back to the Committee on the approach to be used in that analysis.

Categories of Delay:

Three principal categories of delays with two subcategories in each were discussed at length and agreed to as follows:

Principal Categories of Delay (Delays primarily due to):

- Delays (greater than 14 minutes) under airline control (e.g., crew, maintenance)
- Delays (greater than 14 minutes) due to the air traffic system (e.g., ATC, airports, capacity)
- Delays (greater than 14 minutes) due to weather (extreme, below minimums)

Secondary Categories of Delay (delay due to rub-off, resultant)

- Delays (greater than 14 minutes) under airline control (e.g., crew, maintenance)
- Delays (greater than 14 minutes) due to the air traffic system (e.g., ATC, airports, capacity)
- Delays (greater than 14 minutes) due to weather (extreme, below minimums)

Arrival delays: There was a lengthy discussion about how to report arrival delays and the Committee agreed to return to this item at another meeting. It was noted that arrival delays could be calculated by using the actual gate-to-gate time information currently reported under Part 234 and the block times reported. No decision on arrival delay reporting categories was made and this issue will be revisited.

5) Applicability of Part 234:

Discussion was initiated on the appropriate scope of Part 234 and whether, and based on what criteria, airlines not currently required to report on-time performance data should be required to report such information. Some members felt strongly that this would be onerous to smaller regional airlines and to code share partners. Others felt that this information is already being collected so that reporting it to U.S. DOT should not be a problem, although it was acknowledged that causes of delays are not currently reported. One member pointed out the interconnected nature of the aviation system and the fact that all aircraft contribute to the ability of the FAA and airports to manage the demand for airspace and airport space. Another member noted that regionals enjoy very low levels of complaints with the DOT's Office of Consumer Affairs and suggested that expanding the scope of the requirements to include regionals

would create a burden for smaller carriers with limited resources. Others suggested that this may be due to consumer lack of understanding that other than a major carrier was being used for a portion of their trips. It was emphasized that regional carriers vary in size and scope of service and that only 14% of RAA members were wholly owned code-sharing partners and may not have the resources necessary to track and report this information on a monthly basis. Several members felt that for code share flights, the consumer does not distinguish between the primary carrier and code share partners and that their marketing, ticketing, and pricing systems are all interconnected.

Criteria were suggested for evaluating whether the applicability of the rule should be expanded. These included: 1) the burden other than current reporting carriers place on the aviation system, 2) impacts on passengers, 3) revenues, and 4) enplanements. Further, it was suggested that the cost of reporting, stability of the list of air carriers reporting, and reasonableness of reporting requirements be considered.

The current rule requires only those air carriers providing scheduled domestic passenger operations whose share of the industry's total domestic scheduled-service passenger revenues exceed one percent to report Part 234 information. The U.S. DOT Office of Airline Information reviews the list of carriers that are required to report annually.

No decisions about the scope and applicability of Part 234 were reached and the Committee agreed to discuss this issue in more detail at a future meeting. The U.S. DOT agreed to provide information on the percentage of total domestic passenger traffic covered by the on-time performance reports of air carriers currently required to report such information.

6) Future Agenda Items

The following issues were discussed as future agenda items.

- Consumer needs for better information
- MIT/Volpe Global Aviation Program- (presentation)
- Best Practices in Improving the Travel Experience- (presentation)
- Arrival Delay reporting
- Scope of Part 234 requirements
- Real Time Information
- U. S. DOT Approaches to combining and/or manipulating data sources for analysis

7) The next meeting will be held on ***Wednesday, November 1 at 11:00 a.m. in Room 2230.*** The Thursday, November 2 meeting will commence at 9:00 a.m. with a goal of adjournment by 4:00 p.m.